

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed February 3, 2003, claims 1 and 35 have been amended. Claims 1-38 are active in this application, of which claims 1, 10, 22 and 35 are independent. The Office Action indicates that claims 10-34 are allowed and claims 2, 3 and 36 are objected to but allowable if presented in independent form.

Based on the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding rejections and they be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 35 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,411,357 issued to Ting, *et al.* ("Ting") in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,888,632 issued to Haller ("Haller"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Ting fails to teach or suggest the claimed light interception pattern formed on the same material as the semiconductor pattern. Regarding this missing feature, the Examiner asserts Haller teaches "a light interception pattern 26 formed on the same material as the semiconductor pattern ..." (Office Action, Page 3). This assertion is respectfully disagreed with.

In this response, independent claims 1 and 35 are amended to clarify the difference between the claimed invention and the cited references. Amended independent claim 1 recites "a light interception pattern formed of the same *layer* as the semiconductor pattern". For example, this feature is shown in Fig. 2 of the present application, in which the light interception layer 44 is formed of the same layer as the semiconductor pattern 40.

In this regard, the amorphous silicon layer 26 (i.e., asserted light interception layer 44) is independently formed on the thin amorphous silicon layer 20, and therefore is not formed of the same layer as the thin amorphous silicon layer 20.

As such, none of the cited references teaches or suggests the claimed "light interception pattern formed of the same layer as the semiconductor pattern", and hence claim 1 is patentable over Ting and Haller. Claims 4-6 and 8 that are dependent from claim 1 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Amended independent claim 35 recites "a light interceptor made of the same *layer* as the semiconductor layer" and hence would be also patentable over the cited references. Claims 37 and 38 that are dependent from claim 35 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection over claims 1, 4-6, 8, 35, 37 and 38 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ting in view of Haller, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,485,997 issued to Lee, et al. ("Lee"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7 and 9 are dependent from claim 1. As previously mentioned, amended claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Ting and Haller because none of them teaches or suggests the claimed light interception pattern made of the same *layer* as the semiconductor layer.

Lee is introduced to show "wherein common electrode is formed on the same plane as said plurality of gate lines" and "wherein said pixel electrode is formed on the plane different from said plurality of data lines" are of conventional art. However, Lee fails to cure the deficiency from the teachings of Ting and Haller because it fails to teach or suggest the claimed

light interception pattern made of the same *layer* as the semiconductor layer. Thus, the asserted combination would not render the claimed invention obvious.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection over claims 7 and 9 be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-38 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: May 5, 2003

McGuire Woods LLP  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280  
HCP:WSC/kbs

#185037 v1A - 61920178AA - AMND re FOA 02/03/03